



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,965	07/13/2001	Lisa Steury	40655.2200	3802

66170 7590 02/28/2007
AMERICAN EXPRESS TRAVEL RELATED SERVICES CO., INC.
c/o SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 E. VAN BUREN STREET
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202

EXAMINER

SHEIKH, ASFAND M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,965	STEURY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Asfand M. Sheikh	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8,10 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8,10 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment files on 07-Dec-2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 17-22 are pending for examination. In light of the amendments made this action has been made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 17-18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson et al. in view of Chung et al.

As per claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 17, 20, and 22, Hundson et al. teaches receiving traveler charge card transactional data that facilitate charging fees (Hundson et al., see at least abstract), obtaining a user profile comprising account data (e.g. "corporate charge card" and "personal visa") and traveler charge card transactional data, wherein traveler charge card

Art Unit: 3627

transactional data defines a plurality of fees (Hudson et al., see at least, FIG. 3), charging a first account (e.g. "corporate charge card"), according to said user profile, for a cost related to said travel transaction (Hudson et al., see at least, 0043); determining said fee based upon traveler charge card transactional data and user profile wherein said fee represents an extra charge (e.g. "in-room movie") related to said travel-related transaction in addition to said cost (Hudson et al., see at least, 0044); charging said fee to a second account (e.g. "personal visa") according to said user profile (Hudson et al., see at least, 0043), providing an enhanced descriptive billing statement; wherein said enhanced descriptive billing statement: (i) recites said cost related to said travel-related transaction (ii) separately recites said fee; and (iii) recites indicia indicating that said fee and said cost are related to each other (iii) (Hudson et al., see at least, FIG. 17); wherein said receiving, establishing, determining, and charging steps are performed by at least one computer (Hudson et al., see at least, 0036).

The examiner notes Hudson et al. is silent with respect to receiving a Passenger Name Record from a travel reservation system, related to said travel-related transaction.

Art Unit: 3627

Chung et al. teaches receiving an Account Interface Record (AIR) in a specified format that contains all information found in a Passenger Name Record (PNR), that is received from a travel reservation system (CRS) (Chung et al., see at least, col. 9, lines 21-28 and col. 10, lines 17-44). The examiner notes that the AIR is synonymous to a PNR, and further contains fee information, that is downloadable to any database system for further processing.

It is in the examiners position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hudson et al. to include receiving an Account Interface Record (AIR) that contains all information found in a Passenger Name Record (PNR), that is received from a travel reservation system (CRS) as taught by Chung et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to have the ability to download travel data to a computer in order for ease of integration in general ledger documents and files (Chung et al., see at least, col. 4, lines 14-17).

As per claim 2, the examiner notes Hudson et al. is silent with respect to wherein the travel reservation system is a Computer Reservation System.

Art Unit: 3627

Chung et al. teaches a Computer Reservation System (Chung et al., see at least, col. 9, lines 21-28 and col. 10, lines 17-44).

It is in the examiners position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hudson et al. to include a Computer Reservation System as taught by Chung et al. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 1, above.

As per claim 4, Hudson et al. teaches wherein a plurality of fees are charged to said plurality of accounts associated with said user profile (Hudson et al., see at least, 0045 and FIG. 3).

As per claim 5, Hudson et al. teaches providing to a management information system enhanced descriptive billing statements (Hudson et al., see at least, 0046 and 0047).

The examiner notes Hudson et al. is silent with respect to utilizing Passenger Name Record for travel related transactions.

Chung et al. teaches an Account Interface Record (AIR) in a specified format that contains all information found in a Passenger Name Record (PNR), that is received from a travel reservation system (CRS) (Chung et al., see at least, col. 9,

Art Unit: 3627

lines 21-28 and col. 10, lines 17-44). The examiner notes that the AIR is synonymous to a PNR, and further contains fee information, that is downloadable to any database system for further processing.

It is in the examiners position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hudson et al. to include receiving an Account Interface Record (AIR) that contains all information found in a Passenger Name Record (PNR), that is received from a travel reservation system (CRS) as taught by Chung et al. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 1, above.

As per claim 8 and 18, Hudson et al. teaches providing said account with fee reconciling information (Hudson et al, see at least, 0042).

Claim 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson et al. in view of Chung et al. as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Felix et al.

As per claim 19, Hudson et al. teaches fee reconciliation information (Hudson et al., see at least, 0042).

Art Unit: 3627

The examiner notes the combination of Hudson et al. in view of Chung et al. is silent with respect to sending reconciliation information to a credit entity.

Felix et al. teaches sending reconciliation information to a service provider (Felix et al., see at least 0052). The examiner notes that the billing service provider is a credit entity.

It is in the examiners position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Hudson et al. and Chung et al. to include sending reconciliation information to a service provider as taught by Felix et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide an archived history of account transactions that take place.

Claim 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson et al. in view of Chung et al. as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Buchanan.

As per claim 21, Hudson et al. teaches providing a facilitated entity with data via a management information system (Hudson et al., see at least, 0048-0050).

Art Unit: 3627

Hudson et al. is silent wherein the data consists of periodic reports and Passenger Name Records.

Chung et al. teaches providing PNR data to system (Chung et al., see at least, col. 9, lines 21-28 and col. 10, lines 17-44). The examiner notes similar motivation to combine is used as in claim 1.

Buchanan teaches providing reports to a system (Buchanan, see at least, col. 11, lines 64-67).

It is in the examiners position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hudson et al. to include providing reports to a system as taught by Buchanan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide data that highlights activities of ones business in order to make decisions regarding ones business.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 17-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8a-4:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Asfand M Sheikh
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

ams
23-Feb-07

 2/26/07
F. RYAN ZEENDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER